

09/672,639

00AB154

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-14 and 22-29 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 22 and 28 have been amended herein. A complete listing of the claims in revised amendment format showing changes made can be found at pages 2-5. Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and comments herein.

**I. Rejection of Claim 28 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph**

Claim 28 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner has identified a recited claim limitation containing insufficient antecedent basis. Claim 28 has been amended herein to provide proper antecedent basis. Hence, this rejection should be withdrawn.

**II. Rejection of Claims 1-14 and 22-29 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

Claims 1-14 and 22-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Tjandrasuwita (U.S. 6,198,469). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

Tjandrasuwita fails to disclose, teach or suggest all the claim limitations of independent claims 1 and 22.

For a prior art reference to anticipate, 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that "*each and every element as set forth in the claim is found*, either expressly or inherently described, *in a single prior art reference.*" *In re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (quoting *Verdegaal Bros., Inc. v. Union Oil Co.*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)) (emphasis added). Furthermore, "*An anticipating reference must describe the patented subject matter with sufficient clarity and detail to establish that the subject matter existed* and that its existence was recognized by persons of ordinary skill in the art." *ATD Corp. v. Lydall, Inc.*, 159 F.3d 534, 545, 48 USPQ2d 1321, 1328 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (emphasis added).

09/672,639

00AB154

Tjandrasuwita does not disclose "a logic device adapted to ... provide the selected pixel data to a single output, wherein the single output can provide data to both CRTs and LCDs," as recited by claim 1 or "a parallel output means ... for providing the selected pixel data at a single parallel output according to the selected display mode, wherein the single output provides data to both CRTs and LCDs," as recited by claim 22. As disclosed in the specification, the subject raster engine is programmable to support many different and disparate display types over the same interface (See page 9, lines 3-5, and Fig. 31). Accordingly, the engine can support, *inter alia*, analog CRTs, analog LCDs, as well as digital LCDs. Conventional raster engines and video controllers require manual rerouting of signal connections to interface different display formats, whereas the present invention provides for universal connectivity (See page 9, lines 23-26). Although, Tjandrasuwita does provide support for both LCDs and CRTs, it merely does so in a conventional manner. As shown in Figure 1, Tjandrasuwita provides separate outputs from the computer system for a CRT and an LCD wherein the LCD output is routed through a separate flat-panel interface. Therefore, Tjandrasuwita does not anticipate claims 1 and 22 at least because Tjandrasuwita does not disclose providing selected pixel data at a single output, wherein the output can provide signals to both CRTs and LCDs, as recited by the claims. Furthermore, claims 1 and 22 are not rendered obvious by Tjandrasuwita at least because Tjandrasuwita is not concerned with providing universal connectivity, but rather teaches a frame rate modulation technique for passive matrix LCDs. Accordingly, claims 1 and 22 (as well as claims 2-14 and 23-29 depending therefrom) are allowable and withdrawal of their rejection is respectfully requested.

Still further, claims 28 and 29 provide additional bases for allowance above and beyond those discussed with respect to claims 1 and 22 from which they respectively depend. In particular, claims 28 and 29 disclose a logic device or an output means comprising *two or more* of a pixel shifting logic system, a YCrCb encoder, and a DAC. The Examiner intimates that multiplexer 208 of Fig. 2 discloses these limitations. However, multiplexer 208 only provides a mechanism for selecting *one* of TFT data or STN data. For at least this additional reason, withdrawal of the rejections to claims 28 and 29 are respectfully requested.

09/672,639

00AB154

**CONCLUSION**

The present application is believed to be condition for allowance in view of the above amendments and comments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063.

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP



Himanshu S. Amin  
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP  
24<sup>TH</sup> Floor, National City Center  
1900 E. 9<sup>TH</sup> Street  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
Telephone: (216) 696-8730  
Facsimile: (216) 696-8731